

M2037  
Thursday, July 8, 1971  
Barn  
Group II  
Grammar of Work, Tape 2 of 9

Mr. Nyland: So it's very interesting, isn't it: a new engineer, new brooms. I have to clean the ship.

I would like to do as if you really don't know very much about Work. I would like you to ask questions, very simple, and based on your attempts. And if you don't know what kind of attempt you should make, you should ask, "What should I do"; and also, when you ask that, you must have a desire that when it is clear what you should do, that you want to do it. That's the difference between curiosity and a real interest. And I would like to put these kind of meetings, now, on that kind of a basis; so that it could become, together with the Mondays in New York, a certain series which I hope can be useful in the future if we can actually have good kind of questions and if I can have answers that I could give which remain simple: even with a little perspective, never deviating from the substance of the principle.

So, I would like to try not to talk too much by myself and to make it a lecture. I would like you to imagine that you have your own Group. I know the difficulty that is involved in that, but you have to make that attempt. Also, that sometimes you may want to talk as if you are talking with me privately—somewhere at Firefly House—but that in reality the privacy is not needed when it has to do with your Work and your attempts, and sometimes a little bit with your life as you have to ... as you *have* to live it, dependent very much on your type and your interest and the realization of what you consider necessary for yourself. So that the accent of your questions should be on what *you* wish and where you need clarity. And again and again, it has to be based on the assumption that you're honestly interested in Work, and that you want to take the responsibility on yourself to ask me and almost insist. And the responsibility is, that I spend the

time in trying to answer you.

In the past, it has been many times that I just talked, and not knowing if it goes in one ear and out of the other or if somehow or other it gets stuck in your brain or perhaps is divided in your head and part of it goes to your solar plexus or maybe your heart, or to your sympathetic nerve system—that of course I don't know. But you *would* know if you had a Conscience, because that will actually decide if what you take in is going to the right place.

Don't let's talk too much about ordinary life; only when it is lived in connection with the ability of you, on the part of yourself, to see where the accent of inner life can be placed. And try to formulate your questions in such a way that you are clear about that kind of an aim. I do not expect you really to be able to do that in the beginning, but this is one of the reasons why I would like to have some meetings in succession; because what we talk about in one meeting can bear fruit in the next, and I would like, if necessary, to check up, if you allow me, to see what you have done with what we have talked about; so that it is not simply left to you, but that you try to make me partner in your attempts.

You must understand what is the meaning of this particular saying. I'm interested in your life. I would like you to understand yourself, to the extent that you are capable, regardless of your type and regardless even of your upbringing; but in general considering oneself as a personality which is now walking on the Earth and has a certain life and fulfilling obligations of that life-span for yourself, that you have come to conclusions about yourself which have ended up into a questioning attitude: "What will I do with this, all of this that I happen to go through and that is partly forced on me, but nevertheless I cannot run away from it." And then I want to know, quite definitely, what is the best 'way' to take.

You ask, as it were, for 'guidance.' In the beginning you need that little bit of help, because I'm quite convinced that you really cannot get it out of books. They are not written in such a way that they engage your attention enough to be able to say, "This is A, and B, and C." And at the same time, it is that what I have in mind when we now talk, so that these kind of meetings could become what I've called, before, a little 'Grammar,' or even a vocabulary, of something that you want to carry sometimes with you or look up, that could function as a dictionary. If it is lucid enough, it could become an encyclopedia of Work for yourself. Not only an index. An index only refers to that what is in a book. That what I have in mind as a Grammar is a means of understanding yourself by the introduction of words and defining them;

and you supply in that kind of grammar, on the pages which are still left blank, your own experiences, comparing it with the prescriptions as given and coming to conclusions which are your own and dependent entirely on the wish to apply that what you have read in the Grammar, and to make it real for yourself in your life.

If these meetings can be understood in the right way, you will continue to write for yourself on the blank pages. That is, when one has a meeting, you get some information that can be useful and then it is up to you, every day of the week, to see how much you can remember and if that what you have heard can remain useful. And if questions then arise, it would be very good to ask them in order to put you again on the right road, if that is possible, and at the same time, if you do ask and it seems to me sometimes that you may be on the wrong road, that I have, I call it sometimes, ‘audacity’ to tell you that you have to be careful and look out for danger.

That is the idea of these kind of meetings. How long they will last, it depends a little bit on time and I’ve said maybe in ... after the middle of August they may have to stop because I am planning to go to the West Coast at the end of August. But aside from that, I have already broken a promise to myself so often; that when we had meetings in 1971, that I was not going to talk and gradually I started again and again—particularly on Saturday, and then every once in a while a little bit at lunch; and I felt that in doing that I was not really violating the promise, because it is something that one has to watch: to see what is there, on the part of other people with whom one has talked, that is alive in them and trusting that that what they understand goes in the right direction, and the responsibility of talking about Work includes the necessity to see that that what is being said is understood in the right way, and is applied in the right way.

And of course you must know that every once in a while I have had my doubts about such application and, in general, very much about the description of such ideas in the presence of others. It is mainly to try to stimulate everybody I can reach, everybody who can, in that sense, be open to what I would like to say. And knowing very well for myself my own limitations so that every once in a while I am confronted with the inability to really be so absolutely clear that there is no further question, that many times when I do say certain things which I believe are logical, they may not be completely logical to you, and somehow or other I may even be at fault in talking every once in a while a little bit too much and elaborating on ideas which I feel are important but may not have that kind of an importance for you as yet, or maybe never will—that of course I do not know.

The question of the accent for yourself always remains on your own Conscience. And the Conscience is fed for each person by the state of his feeling. When the state of his feeling can be deepened and become more Objective, it will be an emotional attitude. And the reception on the part of this emotional state, will create in a person an openness for receiving data which are useful and then can be judged by his Conscience; and as a result of that judgment, that what takes place in the personality of a person is that it is lifted up and becomes a little freer from the ordinary affairs of life, and that the bondage is gradually reduced. It depends on that feeling going over into a different kind of a state; and the introduction, in feeling, of Impartiality will give you an emotional state of freedom.

I think you must keep that in mind when you ask questions. That is why I emphasize, now, that when you ask a question you must really know that you want to find out, that you don't ask a question just for the gallery. Ask a question based on the experiences of your life for which you then want an answer because, almost I would say, sometimes your life should 'depend' on it. But that's a very big saying, because it is not the case with us, that your life—your inner life—takes that much room ... takes up so much room in the way you now live. But that can change, and I hope that gradually these kind of ideas will start to penetrate more and more, so that you get out of your state of superficiality.

We are very much ... very often too superficial, not knowing what is really required of us simply because God doesn't tell us to be not superficial. We are not, in the first place, open to that kind of influence, and in the second place it probably is very little use to God Himself. We have a function to fulfill on the Earth, and the way we are taught is by Mother Nature and by Mankind as a whole—also influenced by Mother Nature. But what we wish if we can live in this society of chaotic conditions and all the different economic adventures that we have to go through, that somehow or other you will be able to hold on to that what is more important; even in your ordinary life, even if I have said several times in your breathing should be. Before one reaches that state, a long travel, a long road, a very long way has to be gone through, and most likely with a great deal of suffering.

The reason we talk is to give you encouragement, that we hope that you will not forget this kind of Work in your life, that regardless of where you will be and whatever devious roads you may have to travel and whatever kind of friends you will meet in the future, that there is something much more solid within yourself which you can defend for yourself when you are

confronted with influences which might wish to take it away from you; that you are strong enough in the solidity of your own individuality which, in the beginning being very small, is still very much alive if you allow it to grow.

Maybe we should talk. Maybe I should stop now, and ask for questions. I say again, “Do as if you are in your own Group, as if you want to ask questions of a Nucleus.” Be very simple about it, and don’t be fearful. Don’t hesitate to talk or to say what you think is on your heart; for whatever it may be; if it is too superficial, I will tell you that I don’t want to spend the time in answering it. It won’t matter at all.

A Group meeting is very much like a Movement. A Movement Group is not carried out because you want to become a beautiful ensemble of people so that there could be an audience to look at you and say, “How well and beautiful it was all put together.” The accent for a Movements Group is constantly on yourself, and on your body, and on your ability to make certain movements a little out of the extraordinary, but nevertheless of use to you because it gives you a chance to be able to confront your head with the necessity of telling your body what to do. And it is nobody’s business who looks at you. It is your inner life that you want to make partner of yourself.

This kind of a meeting has to do with your inner life, and don’t hesitate to ask what you wish to ask. And don’t pay attention to anyone around you. Criticism will really never help you. It belongs to the ordinary world. And with criticism, that what takes place in you as a reaction is quite definitely unconscious behavior. Try to stay clear from that. Be as you are. Accept yourself for whatever it is, accept others for whatever they are; and leave them alone, and they will leave you alone.

What questions have you. [coughing] Don’t cough too much. If you want to, get some water. Don’t disturb the Group.

Yah. You have to give your name, because I cannot see you.

Jim Fosso: Jim Fosso, Mr. Nyland.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, Jim.

Jim: I read about Pogossian a week ago and talked about it a little bit, but I can’t leave it alone, uh, because it bothers me concerning the fact of my own laziness, uh...

Mr. Nyland: How do you see Pogossian.

Jim: I see Pogossian as a man whose ... whose inner life occupied a great deal of his time.

Mr. Nyland: He was a man with constant interest, wasn't he.

Jim: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: He didn't allow himself to be dictated by the influences of the outside world. He had within himself a fountain which constantly should work for him, and for him to acquire knowledge. It was not the emphasis on his inner life, really, although whenever there is some kind of a well where water wells up from one, it's not always easy to decide where it comes from.

There are deep wells and there are also ordinary wells—also on the Earth. If we have an ordinary well that goes just about thirteen feet or so, or perhaps even a little bit more, we are dependent on the outside pressure of the atmosphere how deep you can go and even pump it up. But there is also a deep well that can be penetrated much further into the Earth, and for that we need a special kind of a pump which is empowered by certain ... either electric or some other kind of energy form. And it is necessary that when one drills, first that you have to expect that you will not reach water as yet and it may be at hundred feet only; and then maybe a couple of drops; and then a little bit further maybe one gallon to a minute; and further down more ... hoping that you will have a certain vein that gives water, and sometimes you drill for four hundred feet and there is no water.

You see, this is the way life is; because it is not at all a guarantee that when you Work you will reach your inner life. And it's not at all that Pogossian is the example of Work. It is an example of a Man who wants to find out. And he has to be—and that was of course in that description—a person who has a definite aim, and using his ordinary interests for that aim, to uncover that what is he himself within himself—very much like drilling a deep well and trying to find where is the vein which is alive for myself within my own, call it 'body,' or my own 'Earth.' And although I think Pogossian is a very good example, it does not apply to how different people will have to face Work for themselves when they are confronted with the ideas.

Pogossian was quite right in being busy and kept busy and overcoming difficulties, and not always following the line of least resistance. And I think in that way he can be an example; particularly when the attempts that one wants to make, and for which one wants an example, are the indication, as with Pogossian, that one should not be lazy. And that, I think, is as far as it goes. How far Pogossian himself came, that I don't know. I hope he did a great deal, and if Gurdjieff called him 'remarkable' or one of the 'remarkable men,' most likely knowing him and

being his friend, Gurdjieff probably could vouch for him.

We read about him and then we say, “Can he be, in my particular search, also an example for me.” And immediately I am confronted with the condition of my own Soul ... soil. I live in nature in this particular period. I’m not in the Middle East. I’m not at all brought up in surroundings like there are in Armenia or in Greece. I have to find out what it is that is me and I call ‘myself’ in this kind of a life as I now have to live it. And Pogossian is not living my life; all I can extract from it is the idea of a principle of how a Man, brought up in certain conditions, considers the conditions for himself useful and wishes to continue to live in such conditions which help him to satisfy his aim. And that therefore, I take a principle out of Pogossian’s life. I say, “He had an aim”; and then I say, on the page which is left blank, “Where is my aim”; then I read again about Pogossian on the left side of the page, and I see that he is constantly busy; and then I write on the blank space of my own life, “Am I busy. Do I spend my time wisely,” and I read again about Pogossian: Did he reach certain things that are desirable. And whatever the qualifications may be of the desirability, I look at my own page and I write down, as the third point, “How can I experience my life so that it is desirable for me.”

You see, Jim, with that I Work. Then I forget Pogossian and I don’t want to really ... to be reminded anymore; because he has served his purpose for me, and then one gets rid of him and in its place is my own history on the other side of the page. And that I read again: Do I have an aim. What is it that I really want. Do I spend my time wisely. Could I be called lazy—not so much even in the eyes of someone else, but for my own Conscience. Do I try to follow the line of least resistance. And if there is resis ... a resistance, or that what is an obstacle resisting my attempt, do I get out of the way and consider the detour more profitable for me, or do I go straight ahead, or do I wait until I actually hope that the Zilnotrago is cleared away. And constantly I want to translate anything that I either read or that affects me; anything that has a definite influence on me I want to convert into a means for myself, and I say, “I must write my own story.” And this is an earnest and a very serious matter. I get stuck on that, because it is a little easier to refer back to someone else and admire him, and not to feel that there is any obligation connected with it.

You know, Jim, it is not so difficult to have the wish to Work. It is not so difficult to have an aim. It is not so difficult to have theoretical knowledge about the expenditure of one’s energy. Sometimes it’s not so difficult to say that I am lazy. But it’s very difficult for me at any

one time to translate that what I now think and sometimes feel into an actuality of an application. And this is where, really, the principle comes in and where the beginning is of a trait of my character. Because if I don't do that—wanting to lead gradually to the level of my Being and a total understanding of what I could become and at times I sometimes can reach by means of an effort of Work—that then I must not forget that the road is very long and that drilling for deep water requires a great deal of energy, not to say expenditure of money.

My life could become very simple if I write my own story; if I could take all the different influences that I've lived under or made for myself and I say for the time being they have been useful, and now I can forget about them. Because something in me is precipitated, and it is this precipitant, that what gives the solidity if I can approach it in the right way. I mean by that, that the precipitation within myself, like a deposit, is something of value at a certain time. It may not always be valuable right away, but I must have that kind of belief that if I make an attempt for Work, that something takes place in me, small as it may be, that ultimately there will be validity in it which I can claim; because it is my possession because *I* have Worked for it—or, I would almost say '*I*' has Worked for it.

The realization of that—thanks, then, to Pogossian—is very valuable when I live my ordinary life and, in consideration of that, I say, "In my life, Pogossian has no further name. It has led me to the door of my heart, but he never even helped me to open it." I had to open the door to myself, and then when I close the door, I am alone with my Conscience and I almost have forgotten—than only out of a little gratitude to Pogossian that he brought me to the door.

You see, if one is sensitive about these things ... And it is not only Pogossian, but maybe others. I quote every once in a while from other authors and people who have lived their life. And not the kind of the life that is at the present time so much accepted by this ordinary existence of ours—where we simply believe that certain things are worth so much, and they are blown up out of proportion, completely, of what the value is of such a life—but if I go back to the people who honestly lived their life and did not make so much noise. If I consider Thomas à Kempis. If I say: "What was this man, Erasmus. What was this man, Bach: What did he wish to tell me; what did he do in his simple life, really." If I love music and honestly I know what music could be ... do to me, I don't want to go all the time into the jazzian movement which has nothing else but hollowness in it—at most a little rhythm—but I want substance that can feed me, and perhaps I have to go down a little deeper to find water.

I think it is right that you extract from Pogossian whatever you can, but then the burden is entirely your own, and you consider your life: What am I doing day after day with that what has been given to me. If I can accept that being given as a religious attitude that I should have, or even if I don't—that I say thank God I am healthy or I can do certain things or I have strength, or I have talents without saying that I ought to be grateful for it—I think it would be a sin if I didn't use them. And then the question of laziness. Where is, really, that kind of morality that comes in to judge how I spend my time. And at what particular point becomes my time useful, and where is it still useless? And how much can I allow of uselessness in my life. And what should be the force that I then apply to make certain time elements—seconds or minutes or hours—useful for me? And again the question: Is it useful, for *what* of me; and what is the satisfaction for myself that I'm looking for.

Those are the questions. Leave Pogossian. I say, "leave him alone." He lived his life and it is wonderful; and that, I would say, is just about all, and then you close your eyes and close the book, and then you start reading within.

Jim: Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: Yah? Tell me—name. Can you hear me?

Kerry Millay: Are you talking to me, Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: I'm talking to someone who held his arm up.

Kerry: I had my arm up.

Mr. Nyland: Yah, who is it?

Kerry: Kerry Millay.

Mr. Nyland: Who?

Kerry: Kerry Millay.

Mr. Nyland: Yes. What is the question.

Kerry: I'd like to know how I can find the right place in myself to make a Work attempt from.

Mr. Nyland: The right place is always there. You don't have to find it.

Kerry: The reason I asked the question is that often I make an attempt and sometimes I think that I'm getting results, and sometimes I build a whole series of attempts and...

Mr. Nyland: What kind of result do you expect. What are you looking for.

Kerry: I wish to have something that could tell me the real truth about myself.

Mr. Nyland: That is easy. When there is no dispute between your mind and your feeling, you

have the truth.

Kerry: Yes, but very...

Mr. Nyland: No, there is no 'but' about it, because as soon as there is a thought, then of course you are away from the truth. Because if you're honest about Work, whenever a thought enters your feeling will say you shouldn't have the thought, then there is a conflict. I'm talking about the unity between mind and feeling.

Work, as I said, is always there and always available. That does not mean that at certain times the conditions are a little bit more conducive and helpful than at other times. But you don't have to hunt for it. You carry your own instrument with you, any time. You can even become, in the ordinary sense, conscious of your existence when you are sufficiently alive. Nobody is expected to Work on himself in his physical sleep. When I open my eyes, I have the opportunity to know that I have a body which exists and is active. I also know that the body manifests, and usually as a result of that what I feel and think. In an ordinary, superficial arrangement there's not much conflict, because very often the mind is not interested if it is a feeling affair, and the feeling is not interested if it is an intellectual affair. But, that kind of superficiality is quite all right for the body to continue on the existence. I don't make an attempt to eat so Consciously that I say, "That what is now my food and I take in, at the moment when I swallow it, it becomes Conscious for me." Life is much simpler. And whenever you make a big affair of ordinary work—that you should apply it—you're on the wrong road.

Now, I've spoken for about two minutes and probably you have listened, and you had no chance at all to be able to become Aware of yourself. Now, the rest of the meeting you make such attempts for yourself: to be Aware of there where you are, and the acceptance of yourself as you are. There is your opportunity. And when you get up at the end of the meeting, you try to continue with it regardless of the hustle and bustle of the other people around you. When you get into the car, you try to remember it again, to see if somehow or other there may be an opportunity of something of yourself being Aware of you. And whatever you want to call then the little 'I' existing, and in whichever way you would like to make an attempt to create it, that simply you make such attempts at such a time. When you drive the car, I wouldn't advise you too much because you have to have energy to see where you are going. But when you get out of the car, I have no doubt that ... that at such a time you could remember yourself.

When I say 'remember yourself,' it's the same as saying try to become 'Aware' by means

of something that could start to function as an Objective faculty. Work is much more simple than you make it, and you don't have to make it a 'big affair,' I say. It is just there, and if you wish you can take it. If it isn't there, it passes you by.

You understand what I mean? [pause] Do you say anything?

Kerry: Uh, I'll try, I'll try to do that.

Mr. Nyland: No, the question is: Do you understand what I said.

Kerry: I understand what you say.

Mr. Nyland: Good. If you understand it, you will be able to do it. If it is just ordinary knowledge, you won't do it. Do you understand the difference between the two? When it is ordinary knowledge, it goes in your head and you may lose it, and it may not stay in your memory. When it has become understanding, it means something else of your feeling has joined the knowledge and if possible—at such a time when the two can get together in the same kind of an aim—you yourself as a personality become affected, and then it will affect the level of your Being, and as a result there will be understanding. Reversely, when there is understanding, it will be translated into the wish to remember it for a purpose of getting *more* understanding.

So, if you wish, next week you can tell me what you have done.

Kerry: All right.

Mr. Nyland: Good.

Kerry: I'll try.

Mr. Nyland: Good. Yah.

Margaret Fargo: My name is Margaret Fargo, and...

Mr. Nyland: Fargo?

Margaret: Yeah.

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Margaret: ...and I'm very confused about my Work attempts and I fear I am on the wrong road. This...

Mr. Nyland: How long have you been on the wrong road.

Margaret: Not too long, I hope, but...

Mr. Nyland: [chuckle] When did you start on the right road.

Margaret: Um, about ... I'd say about two months ago.

Mr. Nyland: When did you hear first about Work.

Margaret: Uh, a year ago.

Mr. Nyland: Where.

Margaret: In New York. I was in Trudy's Group. I worked for Trudy.

Mr. Nyland: Don't you think that Trudy explained to you what Work is?

Margaret: Um, no.

Mr. Nyland: You mean she doesn't?

Margaret: Well, what you just said, you know, understanding...

Mr. Nyland: Yah, that's right, but the question: first you have to have a knowledge in order to be able to apply it. Don't you think she is clear about what is needed? If I ask you now, for instance, since you say you are confused, what do you think Work is. Say it in your own words. But if you say I would like to make an 'effort,' what kind of an effort do you make.

Margaret: Well for ... for what Work is—um, an Awareness; um, for what Work is to me...

Mr. Nyland: To you—yes

Margaret: ...and what it has been...

Mr. Nyland: No. No, no.

Margaret: Just what it is.

Mr. Nyland: What it is, without even you applying it. Work can be described as a Knowledge indicating what is called the 'only way.' It can be described as a means to reach Objectivity out of a state of subjectivity. It can be described as something that takes place in me; when it is applied, it would reach a state within myself of evolving.

Should we turn it over, Bill?

side 2

All right?

It can be explained in many ways—in describing the aims that one has. There is only one way of describing a method. When you have a medicine, it could be used every once in a while for different sicknesses, but it may have many applications as a medicine, and even more so if you have certain chemical elements—they may have an effect on the body ... of different parts of the body. So, it is now a question of describing the rules of Work on oneself, and that is what I would like you to tell me: How would you explain it to someone else, or how would you explain it to yourself every day.

Margaret: Well, um...

Mr. Nyland: You used the word 'Awareness,' which is right; but you still have to define that.

Margaret: It's the... Well, the physical body would be relaxed...

Mr. Nyland: No, no, no. That's the way of application. I only want a description. The description—which is a prescription—of Work. What is it. What is the process.

Margaret: It's, um, it's the process by how you can find your real Self.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, that is, again, the aim. What is involved in that process. What are the instruments that are being used.

Margaret: The only tools that you have are the ... are the tools that ... that ... that ... that you have within yourself.

Mr. Nyland: Good. What are the tools.

Margaret: Well, for me they're ... they're looking at myself and, um, trying ... trying not to ... trying not to make any judgments, trying not to close anything, to leave it open ... just to...

Mr. Nyland: Do you think you can do that?

Margaret: No.

Mr. Nyland: No. And it is wrong the way you describe it. It is not a question of looking at myself like I do many times when I happen to think how I was, or even when I try to see what I am doing. It is not that process at all, and that I wouldn't call 'Awareness.' The process must of course indicate that it will lead to an aim. If I define the aim of wanting to become Objective, or if I feel that the question of Consciousness, if I define it, should be pure acceptance of facts without interference of any like or dislike, then I can come a little closer to what the process should be. The process means, for me, that something should exist which can become Aware of me as I am.

You see, if I describe the process like that, I will see what kind of instrument I need. In the first place, an entity or something—or sometimes we call it a 'faculty'—which has a certain ability. And the ability is to 'Observe,' as we call it, in Observation of myself as I am. Now, when I say 'as I am,' it already implies that that what is Observing me is pure in its Observation and is not mixed with any kind of a like or dislike of myself. With other words, that what is this entity has to be Impartial to me.

Now, what is this 'me' that this little 'I' has to be Impartial to. Myself as I am has to be under Observation—'scrutinized,' as it were—but in any event, the Awareness of the little 'I' will give me certain facts about myself *as* I am, because if I say not the way I 'like' myself, or the way I 'appear' to be, or the way I 'describe' myself, all of that would for me be ordinary

mind describing something, but I talk about an Objective something as a means to reach a state of Consciousness.

So, whenever what is called the ‘only way’ is described, it has to have certain functions, and the functions have to be understood as far as the aim is concerned, that this little ‘I’ has to have certain properties. The first property is that it is sufficiently alive to be able to live, and in its life to become Aware of the surrounding—that is, what I would say is a fact of an aliveness of anything that happens to exist with life in it. In the second place, I want this aliveness to become manifest in the little ‘I’ in a process of Observing an object. In the third place, I want this little ‘I’ to give me, as I am, information about myself. So that means I have to define the object for that Observation as myself.

I then have to think: How can this little ‘I’, if it is little, function in the best way. Then I’m afraid it has to be explained that when the little ‘I’ is made or created by me—that is, if I want something of that kind to exist which is supposed to help me in giving me more truthful knowledge about myself—that when I want to understand that kind of a process, I must assume that that what I, in my ability unconsciously, would like to create of something which is Conscious, that I really do not know very much about that kind of a creation, and that I cannot really expect this little ‘I’ to be full-grown overnight.

So, it ... it brings into this total concept, the fact that this little ‘I’ must still be very small—even if in principle I could call it ‘Objective,’ that the amount of data it would be able to Observe, or give me, can be very small in the beginning. And I also must understand that if my unconscious brain and feeling would like to create a little ‘I’, I cannot be very clear—or not even sure—that that what I create is already, in its principle, hundred percent Conscious.

You must have talked with Trudy about such things. The little ‘I’ becomes extremely important because it will give me, in time, the possibility of having a guide for my life. And don’t mix up what may be aims with that what is a method.

Now, the question is, how to apply it when I now know what I should do. *When* will I do it and *how* will I do it, I do it whenever the time is right. I can do it when I know that I have a wish which wants to create this little ‘I’. And I think that the time is the best when I have a deeper wish to try even to maintain it, or that the conditions are such that they, as conditions, will not interfere with the creation of something quite unusual for me. The question is now: How I do it, at what time will I do it, in what conditions will I try to make this attempt. In the beginning, very

very simple times, very simple conditions. Because when I wish this little 'I' to exist, it has to have energy. And when the energy is divided between that what I want to give to little 'I' and the creation, and the energy which has to go to the maintenance of my ordinary unconscious state, I don't want my unconscious state to take too much energy away.

Are you still following what I say?

Margaret: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Do you understand now what I mean?

Margaret: Yes, um... I...

Mr. Nyland: Then will you now Work and let me know next week?

Margaret: I ... I... Yes, I would like to say one thing, though.

Mr. Nyland: Yes?

Margaret: That I think perhaps with Trudy it was not the fault of Trudy.

Mr. Nyland: No, no, I don't think it was.

Margaret: Okay.

Mr. Nyland: No, no. I'm not ... That's why I said a little while ago, you must have heard that from Trudy, only you didn't happen to think about it and maybe you didn't place it in the right way—by giving it enough value. You understand now what I mean.

Margaret: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: And you simply apply it in the simplest forms, and that what is the object of Observation is the manifestation of your physical body. So, let's stick to that only.

All right?

Margaret: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Good.

Judy Freed: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Judy: It's Judy.

Mr. Nyland: Yes. What. Who is it?

Judy: Judy Freed.

Mr. Nyland: Judy. Yes.

Judy: I ... there isn't any need for Work in my life right now and I feel ... I feel a need for that need.

Mr. Nyland: [chuckle] Well, we can quibble about that. Because, where does the need come for the need for the need. [laughter] You see, you're kind of playing with words now. Either I have thirst and I wish to quench it, or I don't have it. If I don't have thirst, I don't believe there is anything that tells me you ought to have thirst. Because if that is the case, then I have to have a reason for the thirst. If that reason for the thirst exists, there is reason to satisfy it. If I actually realize that I should have a need, that statement must be based on the acceptance of myself as I don't have a need; and that I cannot accept, so therefore I say I 'should' have a need.

It is much simpler. Because I am what I am at the present time, and I have no interest whatsoever in Work. This statement I make to myself, and I live with it. You see, I'm not going to take what has happened in the past and that now is telling me that I 'ought' to Work; because in the past I Worked because I had a motivation, at the present time there is no motivation so I cannot Work. When there is no motivation, there is impossibility of Work.

Work must always be preceded by the wish to Work. And the wish to Work must be based on the motivation, which includes many different descriptions of oneself in different kind of states; in which one looks at oneself and sees what one is, or is reminded that one is that way; or experiences certain ways by which one has behaved—in looking back or recalling it; or thinking; or someone else making a remark about it—which produces in me again a thought or a feeling about myself, and mostly then connected with dissatisfaction. It may not always be dissatisfaction. It may also lead to a questioning or an irresoluteness—something that is not solvable for me, something that will not let me sleep enough. But in general, you might say it is a dissatisfaction with either my physical or psychological state. When that is there, there may be a possibility that I can translate it into the wish. But sometimes I'm not even strong enough for that, or that what I see of myself I don't dislike too much.

Keep on saying to yourself, "I can't Work and I don't want to Work." And walk around the house saying that. Emphasize it. Say it, even: "I'll be damned if I want to Work!" Go ahead and say it. It is much closer to the truth than saying that you should have a need for the needs of Work. The two needs negate each other, and it does not lead to any positivity.

Can you agree with that. Judy, you are mixing up your ordinary state in ordinary life with that what belongs to Heaven, and you start to judge your desire for Heaven as a result from the state in which you are in ordinary life. Leave ordinary life by itself and settle, as far as you are able, the affairs of ordinary life. But when you wish to Work, you do not wish for anything else

but to Wake Up.

By the way, that is the answer that you should receive—Who was it; Jerry?

Kerry: Kerry.

Mr. Nyland: Kerry. You should know that you cannot look for results—you could not define them, and even if they are there, you would not recognize them. The wish for Work is based on the fact that I'm asleep, and the wish is to Wake Up. I do not know what I will find when I'm Awake. I'm unconscious, I don't like the state of unconsciousness, I want to become Conscious. I Work for Consciousness. When I'm Conscious, I may be able to describe what it is, but I cannot describe it as long as I am unconscious. It's the same thing with Judy. If I wish for Heaven, I have no interest in the Earth. I only want to use the Earth as a steppingstone to go to Heaven. If I want to develop my inner life, I really have no more use for my outer life than only to serve as a means for getting to my inner life.

But, you see how absurd that is for an ordinary Man. Because he never can say that he is so much interested in his inner life that he wants to give up his outer life. Aside from the fact that I don't think he can do it because he's constantly bound by it, when it really would come down to it, he's unwilling to do it. He is not going to give up his unconscious states. He's much too much attached to it, and there is no means of simply telling that he should get rid of it, even intellectually. He can accept that intellectually, emotionally he never will want to give it up. And a person sometimes prefers to simply make statements that he cannot Work, and be satisfied by that statement until it becomes so clear that he should not be satisfied by keeping on ... keeping on saying it, then he will do something.

Keep on saying that you don't need Work, and don't tell yourself you should have a need for Work. The need for Work will come when you start to get to a point of being disgusted with yourself as you are saying "I don't need Work." The negativity in a person always functions as a vice. And I mean by that, now: it grips you and it holds you. This is the terrible thing about negativity. And as soon as I can settle negative states in my ordinary life, I may have a little bit plain sailing. It does not mean I have the wind to be able to profit by and to sail with it, or even against it, but at least I will not be shipwrecked.

Negativity will shipwreck me in my ordinary life, because I have no means to counteract it, than only in the acceptance of it, the realization that negativity will not get me anywhere. But as long as I don't know that I want to say, in my negativity, "You are negative and stay negative

because that is apparently what you wish.” I say there is a point at which you say, “I don’t want that.” Then you will Work.

Yah. What was it.

Phyllis Lehman: I have two questions about the correctness of my Work attempts. And one is that I notice after attempt ... I notice almost where the ... where the ‘I’ seems to be...

Mr. Nyland: Wait a minute. You noticed what?

Phyllis: Where the ‘I’ seems to be.

Mr. Nyland: Yah, it’s maybe nice to speculate about it. I don’t think it matters, does it?

Phyllis: Well, then I try and put it somewhere else.

Mr. Nyland: It’s okay. You can put it anywhere you like.

Phyllis: It doesn’t matter, then?

Mr. Nyland: No, I don’t think so. You’re only interested in what the ‘I’ can give you. Because the interest, regardless where that ‘I’ happens to be, is based on the little ‘I’ functioning. So it must lead not to be able to place where the little ‘I’ is, it has to lead to the increase of knowledge of yourself, or to make sure that the knowledge you have of yourself is truthful. That’s what you’re looking for. The creation of little ‘I’ is only a means to an end. And the end is self knowledge. That’s why I say it doesn’t matter where it is, as long as it functions.

But assuming now for a moment that you know approximately where it is, where is it. Can you tell me?

Phyllis: Well, sometimes it seems to be more above my head...

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Phyllis: ...and at other times more inside.

Mr. Nyland: Yah. You know, it isn’t above your head, but let it be there.

Phyllis: And other times more inside.

Mr. Nyland: Maybe. On your shoulder?

Phyllis: Some ... Not on my shoulder—no.

Mr. Nyland: Where? In your heart?

Phyllis: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: That’s right. And supposing it is in your big toe [chuckle], it still could function, couldn’t it. Can you imagine the little ‘I’ being in ... in your big toe and staring at you?

[laughter] You know, one is interested in the *Awareness* of the little ‘I’. I’m not interested,

even, where it lives. I can philosophize about it, of course, and I can say “it ought to be here” and so forth. I can search for it. You know, it’s the same thing as trying to find where was Gurdjieff buried. What good does it do. After I find it I can say, “Ah, that’s where they buried him.” [laughter] I’m looking for something that is real truth for me; and it does not include the place of the ‘I’. It does include the functioning of ‘I’.

Okay, now let’s assume that it is wherever it is, and you have now little ‘I’ functioning. Now, what is the second question.

Phyllis: I think it’s connected. But it’s ... the importance of the creation is then to turn it back to yourself.

Mr. Nyland: No, no, no. You’re not clear. What is the telescope. There’s an observer at one end and the observee on the other, is there any ‘turning back’?—the way you say it. I’m interested if I am the observee. That means I am being observed. What the observer has to say about me, that’s my interest. So at most you can say if little ‘I’ exists and is gathering information about me, I am ‘interested’ in what is that information. So, if I ascribe to the little ‘I’ the faculty of being able to Observe me and be Impartial about me, I also can ascribe to the little ‘I’ that such facts of my existence are recorded in my ordinary, unconscious memory. There’s no difficulty about that, because apparently Awareness is also a mental process. So, what takes place in my mind as a result of an Observation process, I gather as data about myself being the object, and then it is the same as if the observer tells me about myself.

You understand that? Just imagine the little ‘I’ functioning and becoming Aware of you. And what is this little ‘I’ interested in: The existence of you as you are. And when I say ‘without criticism,’ it means it has to really accept me as I am; because there’s no description necessary, there is no classification, no pigeonholing, no liking or disliking, no feeling, just a cold fact ... but I want to make sure that that what ‘I’ is seeing as Observation is a fact which is truthful.

Do you understand that.

Phyllis: I’m not clear if, after the ‘I’ is ... if you’ve created it, then is it time to ... to do a movement of your physical body?

Mr. Nyland: No, I wouldn’t do that. You can learn a little bit that way, but the main thing is the acceptance of myself as I am. Well, what I am totally—it’s not only my arm, it’s not the movement. I ... I prefer much more that my body is walking or my personality, whatever it is, is walking from one side of the room to another. And during that process I would like the little ‘I’

to 'be there,' as it were, following me wherever I go and Observing me—whatever to see, whatever happens to me as I walk—and all the time being interested in the fact that this body is walking. Now, of course the movement is all right. I can say I can sit quietly, close my eyes and move my hand and so forth, but the reason is that I want the little 'I' to exist—not to move my hand. I use the movement only to make my little 'I' attentive, and then the result of what the little 'I' finds as having 'attention,' as it were, given towards me or becoming Observant of me in that attention of the little 'I', that then the facts which are gathered by little 'I' become my own fact and are truthful.

I hope you understand that, and not be stuck on just moving the arm and then be satisfied because the arm is moving. I'm not interested in the arm moving. I'm interested in little 'I' becoming Observant of the fact that it is moving. But that means that that what I am happens to be moving this, but what the little 'I' is interested in is the fact that I am alive.

Will you try to walk up and down without any rhyme or reason in your room, before you go to bed or when you get up early in the morning. And walk up and down and try to see if perhaps, at a certain time, something could be there—I've called it sometimes a 'shadow,' following you as closely as you are—belonging to you because you have created it for that purpose. If you can, maintain it in such a way that as you walk step by step, there is an Awareness which is situated in this little 'I', at whichever place you want to put it.

You understand that? Simple?

Phyllis: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: And will you do that?

Phyllis: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: And try not to mix it up with other things. And next week you can tell me what you have done. All right? Yah.

Alan Rettig: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Alan: Alan Rettig.

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Alan: Uh, I've been having a lot of morbid thoughts lately...

Mr. Nyland: You have to speak louder.

Alan: I say I've been having a lot of morbid thoughts lately because a friend of mine was killed

in Vietnam. And I've been trying to just observe these things, and...

Mr. Nyland: When you say 'these things'—what. What did you observe.

Alan: Uh... Well, uh, just a lot of fears, things like, uh...

Mr. Nyland: That you might die?

Alan: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Yes. All right. That's morbid, isn't it?

Alan: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: It's all right. I think it's very useful that you consider that. I think it's very good that you experience it. It's not a pleasant one. We had difficulties ourselves. Many of us had to consider the question of life and death, and I think it has shaken up many of us when it happens in the midst of ourselves. In the same way, when it happens to you as your friend, of course you visualize that and you see it and you say, "There, by the Grace of God, I could have been." But you're not, and the fact that you're still alive and are able to think about it should have a meaning. Because if it just left you cold, then of course it had no meaning for you, and your friend could have died without even you turning a finger.

Now you are affected and you say it leads to 'morbid' thoughts; only because you dwell too much on the fact that *he* died. You don't dwell on the fact that you're still alive. I think it should be ... you should be very grateful for yourself that you are alive. You can be sad for him, but I think also that is not necessary; because you don't know why he died, you don't know at all about his life and what he went through or struggled with and what he tried to do and whatever his life was worth to him, and perhaps that at such a time when he died that the death may only be a changing-over into a different kind of existence. If there is any kind of a religion or any kind of an interpretation, partly esoteric for yourself, that you could assume that—that something has taken place for him which then has given him freedom from his physical body. I think one can continue to think about such a person, and even wishing him back. And that, I think, is much too morbid, because you have no right whatsoever to wish him back. Because apparently the laws that govern his life—and also govern yours—you do not understand; and I don't think it is given to you to understand that unless one has suffered many deaths of oneself, and then there can be the understanding of why a person dies.

For the time being, you have to accept it as a fact of nature and belonging to Mother Earth. You are not going to question the necessity of rain—unless you become personally interested

that you are growing a crop and you need rain, and then perhaps be grateful when it comes and you may pray, even, if it doesn't come. But those are all conditions which belong to you, wanting certain things to happen in accordance with your standards. I think a person has to learn that there is something else besides what he himself hopes for, or even thinks in the best of his moments.

I'm afraid you're too superficial. Even with your morbidity, you don't consider yourself. If you can understand this kind of Work as having a certain application for you in your life while you are still alive, you would be grateful to be reminded that someone who was near to you died. And in that reminder, maybe you can give more substance to yourself, and perhaps it could lead to the wish to actually Work. You do not at the present time. You just think a little bit about Work. If you've listened to what we have talked about, maybe you can understand it. If you Work, really your morbidity will go away.

Alan: Thanks.

Renie King: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Renie: Um, I have a question about how to place some experiences in relation to Impartiality and Objectivity.

Mr. Nyland: Let me say this first, before you describe it. Don't try to be Impartial when the experiences involve you too much. It would be utterly useless. Work is not given to be applied in ordinary life in order to overcome conditions of ordinary life. Ordinary life conditions can make you Work, but the purpose for Work is entirely different from the elimination of that what I don't like. So, if you want to keep that in mind when you want to say it, but I'm afraid that Impartiality, if you wish to apply it in what you call 'experiences,' that it is an impossibility—and even then, you're not entitled to it.

Let me know what you want to say.

Renie King: Well, I don't think it had to do with that.

Mr. Nyland: Tell me.

Renie: Um, I ... I've had some experiences of... Well, I would describe it as perhaps more of an emotional nature, like, uh, like just being alive, you know...

Mr. Nyland: Yes. I know what being alive is.

Renie: Yeah, but I mean different than ordinary, and I've wondered...

Mr. Nyland: Now wait a minute. Will you describe that? Different from ordinary: What is that.

Renie: Um...

Mr. Nyland: What is different.

Renie: Well, I don't know. Just really ... just realizing that I was alive, and I didn't know how to...

Mr. Nyland: Good. I can do that anytime when I have a joyful experience.

Renie: Uh, huh. I didn't know how to... I didn't know how that related to Work.

Mr. Nyland: It doesn't. That's exactly what I was telling you.

Renie: Uh-huh. But it's...

Mr. Nyland: It was...

Renie: I sometimes have had those experiences while Working, and I...

Mr. Nyland: No. I doubt it.

Renie: Well I ... I was confused about this. It was several months ago that I was confused about this after talking in a meeting, and so I sort of stopped. For a while I stopped Working because I was confused about whether there was any Impartiality there, because in the meeting somebody mentioned Impartiality and ... and I was confused about it.

Mr. Nyland: Yah. I think that's right. And perhaps it should not have been mentioned in connection with your experience.

Renie: No, it wasn't mentioned as ... Somebody asked me about Impartiality, and I was confused about it then—whether there had been any Impartiality.

Mr. Nyland: Oh. Someone wanted you to tell what Impartiality was?

Renie: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Yah. Can you now? Can you now tell what it is?

Renie: Well, I'm not sure. I'm still not sure how to ... how to place certain experiences. When I hear you talking about...

Mr. Nyland: Where do you think Impartiality belongs.

Renie: Where do I think it belongs?

Mr. Nyland: Where ... what ... what... Yah. What is meant by that kind of a concept, what do you call 'impartiality' in ordinary life. Like a judge: He becomes impartial when he weighs all the facts and does not attach, unduly, value to certain coincidence or certain events, than only in accordance with that what is inherent in the validity of that event. That I call 'impartial,'

because then I can have a judgment because I'm not swayed one way or the other by any kind of a feeling. Sometimes it's possible to be impartial intellectually. If I have to make a judgment about certain facts which I can consider and when they are measured, then of course my impartiality is easy, because I can apply the measure—when it's above the line it is this, and when it's below it is something else—so of course there is the possibility of being impartial in a mental sphere.

When I'm a scientist I must be impartial about the observation of certain facts, but the question of Impartiality regarding oneself has to do with myself and I have no measure for myself, than only the knowledge that I become involved emotionally or with feeling about certain things that I experience; and then the Impartiality requires that that what I notice of myself should be completely free from that kind of partiality—that is, going along with it one way or the other, and I call it a 'liking' or a 'disliking'—so it has a very definite definition. Impartiality for a person ... when one Works, Impartiality means that that what I Observe leaves me cold.

Renie: I ... I still don't understand. Because I don't understand, uh... Can you use emotional states, like a realization that you're alive?

Mr. Nyland: I don't think so. No. I think that when I'm emotionally involved in the state and I like it because I'm alive, or that I'm really involved in it in such a way that I almost forget everything else, I think that a lot of energy goes in that direction and there is nothing that will go to the formation of any kind of an inner life. You see, a deep emotion is not inner life.

Renie: But you ... you just... When you started the meeting tonight you talked about how ... you talked about emotion, and ... and using emotion.

Mr. Nyland: Of course. Emotions can be used when they can be freed from the expression. But in ordinary life, any kind of an emotion is immediately translated into a manifestation, and therefore the energy goes into the manifestation and does not stay as emotion. If I could keep emotional energy free by itself, and perhaps even accumulate it in a certain, let's say, 'storage battery,' then I could draw on it. But as I am, unconscious as I am, I cannot do that. I am, by nature, bound to use all emotional or feeling energy for a manifestation of myself.

Let me explain that a little more. Because in ordinary life, with feeling it is easy to see that any kind of a feeling that I have is expressed in some kind of a physical manifestations—either by the posture, or by the tension of muscles, or by some kind of an expression on my face, or by

certain words that I will use and for which I then even use my mind. That is ordinary feeling. Now, if an ordinary feeling, I try to refine it and it becomes a little bit more of an emotional state. When I go over to what we call 'real' emotion,' that what my feeling was concerned with, which was mostly myself, will, in an emotional state, also include other people, other forms of life. And in that direction then—in, as it were, 'sharing' the feeling and becoming emotional about the existence of other people existing in their life—then that what is an emotional state is a little bit clearer for me and—to some extent, even, not as expressed—stays often with a feeling without giving any idea within myself of how it should be expressed, because I don't know how.

I do not know how much you really know about the three centers and such concepts. It is perhaps very difficult.

Renie: Well, what you just spoke about: how does that relate to Objectivity and Impartiality.

Mr. Nyland: It doesn't relate to it, than only as a source of energy. When it is separate from the manifestation, it becomes a form of energy that could be utilized. But it is a difficult process even to utilize it.

But, you see, we are not talking as yet the same language. I'm afraid you're still confused. Have you listened to some of the other answers I gave?

Renie: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: About little 'I'?

Renie: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: About the attempts one makes in actually having this little 'I' Observe one, and Observe the manifestations of the body?

Renie: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: If you have understood that, then that is your task for this coming week, and you can tell about it next week. But you must make sure that you understand it, otherwise it will lead to more confusion. Will you do that?

Renie: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Okay. I hope you will try.

Yah? Was there an arm up? Not yet. [pause] It is your Work, not mine.

Ibbie Kenna: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Ibbie: It's Ibbie.

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Ibbie: I still have a wish to understand what I was reading in All and Everything, in 'Purgatory.'  
Um, when he talks about Heptaparaparshinokh, and...

Mr. Nyland: Why Purgatory, Ibbie? That's one of the most imp ... most difficult chapters in the book... [tape runs off]

End of tape